

Guide to Reports



Fall 2013

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction	3
Fall 2013 Highlights	3
Online Social Studies Pilot.....	3
Item Descriptors	4
Invalid Tests	4
Contact Us	4
Fall 2013 MEAP Report Descriptors.....	5
Section 2: Scoring.....	6
Definitions.....	6
Multiple Choice Item Scores	6
Constructed Response Item Scores	6
Scale Scores.....	7
Performance Levels.....	7
MEAP Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges - Fall 2013- Grades 3-9	9
Ranges within MEAP Performance Levels	10
MEAP Performance Level Change Table.....	11
Section 3: Reporting	12
Individual Student Report	13
Student Label	16
Parent Report	18
Class Roster	22
Item Analysis Report.....	24
Summary Report	29
Demographic Report.....	33
Comprehensive Report.....	36
Section 4: Additional Sources of Assessment Results	38
Contact Information	39

Revised 2/20/2014

Section 1— Introduction

This guide was developed to assist educators in understanding and using the Fall 2013 Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) results. Reports prepared for the MEAP include both individual level (Individual Student Report, Parent Report, Class Roster, Student Label) and aggregate level reports (Comprehensive Report, Demographic Report, Item Analysis Report, Summary Report).

Aggregate reports reflect the data needed to meet state and federal legislative requirements. In accordance with these mandates, separate aggregate results are provided for the following student populations: 1) all students, 2) students with disabilities, and 3) all except students with disabilities.

Reports included in district and school packets are listed in the table on page 5. Included in the table is a brief description of each report, a list of the student populations represented in the report, and the report recipients. Detailed descriptions of the reports are provided in Section 3 of this guide. ***Schools must distribute MEAP Parent Reports to students' parents or guardians as soon as possible after printed reports arrive, if a copy of the report has not already been distributed.***

All MEAP PDF Reports are available via the Bureau of Assessment and Accountability (BAA) Secure Site. Beginning with Fall 2013 test results, hard copies are printed for Parent Reports, and Student Labels only.

Fall 2013 Highlights

Online Social Studies and Science

Students who participated in the Fall 2013 MEAP Online Social Studies and Science are included on student level reports and their results have been incorporated into the aggregated reports. These students are not identified as online students on the paper and PDF reports, however, they are flagged as tested online in the school's Student Data file.

Item Descriptors

MEAP Item Descriptor documents will be available for each grade level and each subject area assessed in fall 2013. These documents can be accessed at www.michigan.gov/meap. In addition, Narrative and Informational Writing Scoring Guides are available at www.michigan.gov/meap, as well as, the Analytic and Holistic Writing Rubrics.

Item descriptors will be available for 100% of operational test items from the fall 2013 MEAP administration. They identify the Grade Level Content Expectation (GLCE) being assessed and provide a general description of the item itself, an indication of which response was the correct response, a description of the distracters, and in most cases, a description of why each distracter was an incorrect response. The purpose of item descriptors is to provide educators with instructionally-relevant data about student performance on state assessments.

Invalid Tests

Students who attempted a MEAP content area test in fall 2013 but did not receive a valid test score are now reported on the student level reports. While the test score is not reported, the reason for the invalid test is provided. These students do not count toward accountability but will negatively impact participation rates. Students who do not receive a valid score will not be reported on aggregated reports. Tests may be flagged as invalid for the following reasons:

- ◆ Student Prohibited Behavior
- ◆ Tested in incorrect grade (Out of Level)
- ◆ Did not meet “attemptedness” criteria
 - Less than 5 multiple choice responses bubbled
 - All constructed response items blank
- ◆ Non-standard accommodation administered
- ◆ Missing MSDS data (cannot properly identify student)
- ◆ Other mis-administrations
 - Student not given correct test
 - Multiple answer documents returned
 - See MEAP Test Administration Manual for additional examples

Contact Us

The Division of Accountability Services (DAS) welcomes your comments and feedback. We are committed to providing Michigan students, educators, parents, and other stakeholders an assessment program of the highest quality and reliability.

Phone: 1-877-560-8378, option 2

Fax: 517-335-1186

E-mail: BAA@michigan.gov

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Fall 2013 MEAP Report Descriptors

Report	Description	Population	Distribution
Individual Student Report (ISR)	Separated by content area, the ISR provides detailed information on individual student achievement, including scale score, performance level, earned points and points possible. Sorted by class/group code (if provided), and student name.	All Students	Available to School as PDF
Student Label	Summarizes individual student achievement in each content area.	All Students	1 copy to School
Parent Report	Summarizes individual student achievement in each content area, including earned points and points possible, percent correct, and performance level change information (if applicable).	All Students	1 copy to School (to be distributed to students' Parents/ Guardians)
Class Roster	Separated by content area, the roster provides detailed information on student achievement, including scale score, performance level, earned points and points possible. Sorted by class/group code (if provided), and student name.	All Students	Available to Class/Group School as PDF
Item Analysis Report	Separated by content area, the item analysis provides the primary GLCE measured by each test item, a brief description of the GLCE, the item descriptor number, and individual item statistics, including the percentage of students selecting each response.	All Students Students w/ Disabilities All Except Students w/ Disabilities	Available to Class/Group School District State as PDF
Summary Report	Summarizes student achievement for all content areas, including mean scale score and performance level information, as well as year--to--year transitions. The School Summary also provides student score distributions for each content area.	All Students Students w/ Disabilities All Except Students w/ Disabilities	Available to School District ISD State as PDF
Demographic Report	Summarizes the total number of students assessed, mean scale score, and performance level information for each demographic subgroup containing at least 10 students.	All Students Students w/ Disabilities All Except Students w/ Disabilities	Available to School District ISD State as PDF
Comprehensive Report	Summarizes the total number of students assessed, mean scale score, and performance level information for the district or ISD. The district report provides a summary for the district and each school within the district. The ISD report provides a summary for the ISD, followed by each public school district, and then each Public School Academy (PSA) within the ISD.	All Students	Available to District ISD as PDF

Section 2: Scoring

Definitions

All of the processes employed to assess overall student performance begin at the item level. There are two types of items on the MEAP: Multiple Choice (MC) items and Constructed Response (CR) items. Item scores are used to create subscores for each content area and are used in the statistical models and transformations that result in scale scores.

Multiple Choice Item Scores

The majority of the MEAP is comprised of multiple choice items. For these items, students select from the available options, only one of which is a correct response to the item. Students who select only the correct option receive a score of one (1) on the multiple choice item. Students who select one of the incorrect options, multiple options, or did not respond receive a score of zero (0). The string of responses from the multiple choice items (e.g. 1,0,0,0,1,...,1) serve as input for the statistical models used to derive scale scores. Multiple choice items are scanned and scored by computer.

Constructed Response Item Scores

In Fall 2013, the reading and writing tests contained operational constructed response items. The reading operational item was a 3-point reading comprehension item. The rubric used to score each grade-level reading comprehension item contains language directly from the reading passage, such that publishing the rubric would compromise the reading passage itself. For this reason, the scoring rubric is available on the MEAP website; however, an item descriptor for each grade level is published in the MEAP Item Descriptors located on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap).

Reading constructed response items requiring short answer responses are evaluated by human scorers. Guided by precise criteria, scorers review a response for accuracy and completeness and assign 0 to 3 points based on how well the requirements of the prompt are fulfilled. Extensive professional practice and research have refined and validated the critical steps that ensure consistency in scoring. Scorers are trained to ignore extraneous factors such as neatness and to focus on the comprehension demonstrated in the response. Due to the high-stakes nature of these large-scale assessments, the DAS has taken every step possible to minimize scoring subjectivity.

Three writing constructed response items are included in the writing tests: a Narrative Writing prompt, an Informational Writing prompt and a Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample. The Narrative and Informational prompts are scored using analytic scoring rubrics. Trait ratings include 3 points per trait for Ideas (points doubled), Organization, Style and Conventions. The Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample is scored using a holistic rubric with ratings from 0-4. Again, scorers are extensively trained to score student writing and avoid scoring subjectivity. Scorers are trained to ignore extraneous factors such as neatness and focus on the strengths of the responses rather than the weaknesses. Rubrics and scoring guides for the three writing prompt types can be found at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Scale Scores

MEAP scale scores are created from statistical scoring models that make use of each student's responses to both the Multiple Choice (MC) and Constructed Response (CR) items. The purpose is to model students' overall achievement in each content area based on the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs). MEAP scale scores are equated from year to year and form to form, meaning that any differences in the difficulty of items from one year to the next or from one form to the next are accounted for in the calculations of the scale score for the current cycle. Therefore, MEAP scale scores from the same grade and subject can be compared against each other regardless of the year or form of the MEAP the student took.

A simple Item Response Theory (IRT) model: the Rasch Partial Credit (1-parameter) model is used to determine the students' ability estimates. The use of this model results in a table for each subject area that describes a one-to-one relationship between the number of points earned by a student and the scale score earned by the student. This one-to-one relationship between points earned and scale score is a by-product of the statistical scoring model used for scoring the MEAP assessment. Some reports are reported by subscore (domain, focal point, or discipline). Subscores are not equated from year to year, therefore, are less reliable than scale scores and provide only an approximate measure of student performance.

Performance Levels

MEAP scale scores within each subject area can be described in ranges. The labels applied to these ranges are known as performance levels. The MEAP performance levels are: (1) Advanced, (2) Proficient, (3) Partially Proficient, and (4) Not Proficient. The divisions between the levels are often referred to as *cut scores*. Scale score and performance level range tables are located on the following pages.

The cut scores are typically recommended by a panel comprised of educators and other stakeholders throughout the state in a process known as standard setting. To set these standards, the panel uses detailed descriptions of what students in each of

of the performance levels should know and be able to do. Based upon these detailed descriptions and actual assessment items, the panel recommends the score that best separates each performance level from the next to the Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction. The State Superintendent then recommends the results of the standard setting (or modifications of these standards) to the Michigan State Board of Education (SBE). The SBE is the authority who approves the final cut scores and performance level ranges. While the performance level descriptors necessarily differ by grade and subject area, student achievement, as defined by the obtained performance level, can be reasonably compared across subjects within a grade. Such a comparison can be used to indicate whether students are meeting Michigan grade level content expectations in each subject.

In fall 2011, new cut scores were established to ensure parents, students, and teachers are well informed about where students stand relative to being on-track to proficiency in the next grade for grades 3-9, and on-track to career- and college-readiness in high school. The prior cut scores represented a more basic level of achievement needed for the old manufacturing economy. As a result, the career-and college ready cut scores adopted in September, 2011 were noticeably higher than previous years. The new cut scores have been applied to previous years' data allowing for meaningful trend comparisons. Additional information on cut scores can be found at www.michigan.gov/meap.

MEAP Score Categories and Scale Score Ranges Fall 2013 — Grades 3-9

Revised 2/20/2014

Subject	Grade	Level 4 Not Proficient	Level 3 Partially Proficient	Level 2 Proficient	Level 1 Advanced
Mathematics	3	203 - 321	322 - 335	336 - 370	371 - 412
	4	284 - 422	423 - 433	434 - 469	470 - 549
	5	366 - 515	516 - 530	531 - 583	584 - 665
	6	467 - 613	614 - 628	629 - 674	675 - 760
	7	571 - 713	714 - 730	731 - 775	776 - 863
	8	674 - 808	809 - 829	830 - 864	865 - 958
Reading	3	189 - 300	301 - 323	324 - 363	364 - 439
	4	283 - 394	395 - 418	419 - 477	478 - 531
	5	385 - 500	501 - 520	521 - 564	565 - 633
	6	488 - 601	602 - 618	619 - 652	653 - 730
	7	574 - 697	698 - 720	721 - 759	760 - 829
	8	685 - 795	796 - 817	818 - 852	853 - 921
Science	5	349 - 525	526 - 552	553 - 566	567 - 666
	8	666 - 825	826 - 844	845 - 862	863 - 968
Social Studies	6	481 - 592	593 - 624	625 - 648	649 - 737
	9	778 - 898	899 - 927	928 - 959	960 - 1050
Writing	4	252 - 361	362 - 399	400 - 428	429 - 514
	7	526 - 665	666 - 699	700 - 732	733 - 814

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Ranges within 2013 MEAP Performance Levels

Because mathematics and reading are assessed each year in grades 3 through 8, it is possible to track changes in individual students' achievement from grade-to-grade. Tracking transitions between the four performance levels (Not Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced) can be made more precise by tracking changes within each performance level (for example, a transition from the low range of the Proficient category to the high range of that same category). These small ranges are presented in the table below. (Revised 2/20/2014)

Subject	Grade	Ranges								
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid
Math	3	203-301	302-312	313-321	322-328	329-335	336-344	345-355	356-370	371-412
	4	283-400	401-412	413-422	423-427	428-433	434-443	444-455	456-469	470-549
	5	366-482	483-500	501-515	516-522	523-530	531-545	546-563	564-583	584-665
	6	467-585	586-600	601-613	614-620	621-628	629-641	642-656	657-674	675-760
	7	571-685	686-700	701-713	714-721	722-730	731-743	744-758	759-775	776-863
	8	674-784	785-797	798-808	809-818	819-829	830-840	841-851	852-864	865-950
Reading	3	189-275	276-288	289-300	301-311	312-323	324-335	336-348	349-363	364-439
	4	283-362	363-379	380-394	395-406	407-418	419-434	435-452	453-477	478-531
	5	385-474	475-488	489-500	501-510	511-520	521-532	533-546	547-564	565-633
	6	488-579	580-591	592-601	602-609	610-618	619-628	629-639	640-652	653-730
	7	574-672	673-685	686-697	698-708	709-720	721-732	733-745	746-759	760-826
	8	685-772	773-784	785-795	796-806	807-817	818-828	829-839	840-852	853-921

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

MEAP Performance Level Change

Performance level change is used to compare student performance from year to year, and applies only to MEAP reading and mathematics because these are the only subjects tested each year in grades 3-8. Using the old MEAP cut scores prior to September 2011, each of the four performance levels (advanced, proficient, partially proficient, and not proficient) were wide enough to have a high, mid, and low range reliably distinguishable within each performance level. This more precise categorization is useful for tracking performance level change because it allows for the detection of changes *within* a performance level, not just between performance levels. Applying the new, more rigorous career- and college-ready cut scores, some of the performance levels are not wide enough to reliably distinguish between three ranges within the performance level. Because of this, a 9 x 9 transition table is now used (instead of the former 12 x 12) to track performance level change.

The table below delineates the transitions a student can demonstrate on the MEAP reading and mathematics assessments from year to year. On the left side of the table is the previous year's MEAP achievement divided into the various ranges of performance levels. Across the top of the table is the current year's MEAP achievement. Each student's change in performance can be described as fitting into one of these cells by looking at the combination of the performance in the previous grade and the current grade. For example, a student who scored in the low Proficient range both last year and this year will fit within the cell "M", indicating the student is maintaining the performance level achieved in the previous year.

Transition categories are: Significant Decline (SD), Decline (D), Maintaining (M), Improvement (I), or Significant Improvement (SI). These categories reflect whether students are changing their performance relative to increasing expectations.

Year X Grade Y MEAP Performance Level		Year X+1 Grade Y+1 MEAP Performance Level								
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient			Advanced
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid
Not Proficient	Low	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	High	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI
Partially Proficient	Low	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI	SI
	High	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI	SI
Proficient	Low	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I	SI
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I	I
	High	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M	I
Advanced	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	M

Section 3: Reporting

The sample reports included in this Guide to Reports are intended to provide examples of the report formats, data organization, and types of information contained in each report.

Data contained in these sample reports do not refer to any specific district, school, assessment item, or student.

Individual Student Report (ISR)

The intent of the Individual Student Report (ISR) is to provide a detailed description of each student's performance in the MEAP subject areas assessed in that grade level. This report is designed to help educators identify a student's academic strengths and areas which may need improvement. Schools may include these reports in student record files.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the subject area, the grade level, and the assessment cycle. It also lists the name of the teacher (if provided using a Class/Group ID sheet when answer documents were returned for scoring, or if entered during Tested Roster), class/group code, and the names of the school and district the student was enrolled in at the time the assessment was administered.

Section B contains student identification and demographic information, as well as a summary of the student's performance in that subject area. The specific identification and demographic fields reported are:

Student Name	Ethnicity
District Student ID	English Language Learner
Date of Birth	Formerly LEP
Student UIC	Special Education
Gender	Accommodations

If a student's test was marked invalid, a short reason will be provided. Performance data is not provided for invalid tests in Section C and, if applicable, Section D.

Section C provides detailed information on the individual student's performance on each assessment item. All items, except for field test items, are included. The number of points earned and the total number of points possible are reported. Fall 2013 Item Descriptor booklets can be found for each grade level and subject area on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Section D appears on the ISR for reading and writing. It provides constructed response data, including the number of points possible and the number of points earned by the student. Writing trait ratings are provided for writing prompts and condition codes are reported if applicable. If a condition code is present, then the student receives an overall score of zero (0) for the item. A description of the condition codes is provided in the legends at the bottom of the reading and writing ISRs.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

Student Name: **LastNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, FirstNamexxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx X**
District Student ID: 12345678901234567890 Date of Birth: 01/01/1900 State UIC: 1234567890
Gender: M Ethnicity: White
English Language Learner: N Formerly LEP: N SpecEd: Y
Accommodations: Nonstandard

B

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT REPORT

A

Grade 09
Fall 2013
Social Studies

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**



Summary of Social Studies Results

Subject	Scale Score	2013 Achievement Performance Level
Social Studies		No Valid Test Score

GLCE Code	Domain Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
History		
8U3.3.03	Describe major issues: Constit. Convention	
8U3.3.06	Explain: Bill of Rights/limited government	
8U4.1.03	Explain how political parties emerged	
8U4.1.04	Explain development of the Supreme Court	
8U4.2.01	Compare the Northeast and the South	
8U4.2.03	Explain the Expansion of the West	
8U4.3.03	Analyze: antebellum women's rights movement	
8U5.1.04	Describe increased sectional tensions	
8U5.2.01	Explain reasons for secession	
8U5.3.01	Describe positions about reconstruction	
8U5.3.02	Describe early responses: end of Civil War	
8U5.3.04	Analyze intent/effect: 13th/14th/15th Amendments	
6W1.1.01	Describe early migrations of people among continents	
6W1.2.01	Describe transition: hunter gathers to agriculture	
6W1.2.02	Describe natural environm: agricultural settlements	
6W2.1.02	Describe how agriculture led: agrarian civilizations	
7W2.1.05	Describe pastoralism of Central Asia	
6W3.1.03	Compare Mayan/Aztec/Incan societies	
7W3.1.03	Compare features: city-state/civilization/empire	
7W3.1.09	Describe legal codes, communications: regional empire	
7W3.2.01	Describe beliefs of five major world religions	
Geography		
6G1.3.01	Use themes of geography to describe regions/places	
6G4.1.01	Identify/explain examples: cultural diffusion: Americas	
7G1.2.01	Locate major landforms/rivers/climates: E. Hemisphere	
7G1.3.01	Use geography themes to describe regions or places	
6G2.1.01	Describe regional landform/climate: W. Hemisphere	
6G2.2.01	Describe the human characteristics of the region	
6G5.1.01	Describe environmental effects of human action	
6G3.2.02	Identify why ecosystems are attractive for human use	

C

GLCE Code	Domain Abbreviated GLCE Descriptor	Earned / Possible Points
Geography continued		
7G3.2.01	Explain ecosystems differ: latitude/elevation/human	
6G4.2.01	List technologies used to move people/products/ideas	
6G4.4.01	Identify conflict/cooperation among cultural groups	
7G4.3.01	Identify E. Hemisph: modified suitable for settlement	
7G4.3.02	Describe patterns of settlement by using maps	
7G5.2.01	Describe how change is environ. can affect humans	
Civics/Government		
6C1.1.01	Analyze competing ideas: democracy/dictatorship	
6C3.6.02	Compare/contrast: dictatorship/presidential/parliamentary	
6C4.3.01	Explain geopolitical relationships among countries	
7C4.3.02	Explain cooperation needed: international issues	
Economics		
7E1.1.01	Explain incentives in different economic systems	
7E1.1.02	Describe the circular flow model	
7E2.3.01	Explain how governments make economic decisions	
7E3.1.01	Explain the importance of trade: Eastern Hemisphere	
6E3.1.03	How do communications affect economic interactions	

MICHIGAN
Department of
Education

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**



Subject	Scale Score	2013 Achievement Performance Level
Writing		No Valid Test Score

[illegible]

If Condition Code present, Earned Points equal zero.

[illegible]

* Condition Codes: A = Off-topic ‡
B = Illegible or written in a language other than English
C = Blank
D = Insufficient to rate
‡ For SWS only, A = Off-topic/Off-task

Student Record Label

A Student Record Label is provided for each student assessed during the fall 2013 cycle. The labels are mailed to the school for placement in the student record file (CA-60).

Section A contains the district name and code and the school name and code.

Section B contains the student's name, Unique Identification Code (UIC), District Student ID (STU), if provided by the school, date of birth, gender, and grade.

Section C contains the subject areas assessed, the Scale Score (SS) received, and the Performance Level the student attained in each subject area. The Performance Level Change in mathematics and reading is reported for students in grades 4-8.

Performance Levels

- Level **1** – Advanced
- Level **2** – Proficient
- Level **3** – Partially Proficient
- Level **4** – Not Proficient

Performance Level Change Ranges

- SI – Significant Improvement
- I - Improvement
- M - Maintaining
- D - Decline
- SD - Significant Decline
- NM - No valid matching student record

If the student was not assessed in a subject area, or if the test was marked invalid , a Scale Score cannot be reported and the reason is indicated in the Scale Score and Performance Level columns.

99999 SAMPLE DISTRICT
 99999 SAMPLE SCHOOL **A**

LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX,

UIC# 1234567890 **B** STU# 12345678901234567890

DOB: 01/01/1900
 Gender: F
 Grade: 6

Subject	SS	Performance Level	Perf.Level Change
Reading	594	4-Not Proficient	SD
Writing		C	
Mathematics	NS	Non-std Accom	NM
Science			
Social Studies	586	4-Not Proficient	

Fall 2013
meap™

Parent Report

The intent of the Parent Report is to provide a summary description of their student's performance in each subject area assessed on the MEAP. This report is designed to help parents and guardians identify the academic strengths of their student and areas that may need improvement. Information from this report may be helpful when discussing academic progress of the student with the classroom teacher(s). ***Please ensure that Parent Reports are distributed to parents or guardians as soon as possible after printed reports arrive at your school.***

Section A provides the title of the report, the grade the student was in when the assessment was administered, the assessment cycle, the name of the student, and the student's Unique Identification Code (UIC). It also lists the name of the school and the school district the student was enrolled in at the time the assessment was administered.

Section B consists of a brief introductory letter addressed to the parent or guardian of the student describing the purpose of the MEAP, advising of any major changes, and offering suggestions on how the MEAP results might be used.

Section C gives a brief description of each of the four performance levels.

Section D provides the student's scale score and performance level obtained in each subject area assessed for the current year.

Section E provides performance level change information in reading and mathematics from the previous test administration to the current MEAP administration. Performance level change information is available only for reading and mathematics because these are the only two subjects assessed each year.

Section F describes in more detail how the student performed in each subject area.

Fa gives a short explanation of the assessment for each subject area. In addition, the student's performance level for the subject is listed with information on how the performance relates to Michigan standards. For example, if a student received a Level 2 on the eighth grade mathematics assessment, that student is "Proficient" and has met grade level expectations for Michigan students.

Section F continued


Fb provides a graphical representation of the student's overall performance on a specific subject area assessment.

Fc consists of more detailed information regarding the student's performance. Each subject area is divided into sub score groupings: mathematics is divided into focal points, science is grouped within disciplines, and reading, writing, and social studies are divided into domains. For each subject area, the total points earned versus the total points possible for each subscore grouping is reported.

Writing is reported differently. The narrative writing and the informational writing prompts' rubric scores are listed for each writing trait. If received, the condition code is reported and the student will earn a total score of zero (0) for the prompt. A description of the condition codes is provided. In addition, the multiple choice test items and the Peer Response to the Student Writing Sample score (listed as Revise Drafts) are reported for each student.

NOTE: The MEAP results for individual students are most reliable and valid at the overall scale score level for each subject. These scale scores are reliably associated with a performance level. Parents can have confidence that the reported scale scores and performance levels provide accurate information for each subject. Student subscores (at the domain, focal point, or discipline level) are less reliable measures than scale scores and performance levels because there are fewer items per subscore grouping. The subscore results provide only an approximate measure of the student's performance level. Parents should be careful in drawing conclusions about a student's strengths or weaknesses at the subscore level. It is more appropriate to use this subscore information together with classroom assessment data, information provided by the student's teacher(s), and other performance information to guide learning activities.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



MICHIGAN
Department of
Education

District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

Parent Report

Grade 05
Fall 2013



meap
Michigan Educational Assessment Program

School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**

A

Report For:
FIRSTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX X LASTNAMEXXXXXXX
UIC: 1234567890

Dear Parent or Guardian:

In fall 2013, schools across Michigan administered the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) to students in grades 3 through 9. Reading and mathematics are assessed in grades 3 through 8, writing in grades 4 and 7, science in grades 5 and 8, and social studies in grades 6 and 9. (For more detail, visit www.mi.gov/meap.)

MEAP assessments are linked to Michigan's content standards and measure what students are expected to know and be able to do at each grade level and content area to be on-track for career- and college-readiness upon their high school graduation. These assessment results can be used together with other assessment and classroom performance information to provide a more complete picture of student progress and achievement.

I encourage you to discuss your student's MEAP results with teachers and other school professionals who know your student personally. Student performance is reported as: Not Proficient, Partially Proficient, Proficient, or Advanced. A brief description of each performance level has been included.

Parents/guardians and teachers have a greater chance of helping students succeed when they work together to encourage student learning. It is important to know what content is being covered in your student's courses throughout the school year and when your student's homework assignments are due. Discuss your student's studies and interests regularly. Help your student seek learning opportunities outside of school. One resource I highly recommend is the free, online Michigan e-library (www.mel.org).

I hope you find this report both helpful and informative.

Sincerely,



Mike Flanagan
State Superintendent
Michigan Department of Education

Performance Level Descriptors

Level 1: Advanced (L1)

The student's performance exceeds grade level expectations and indicates substantial understanding and application of key concepts defined for Michigan students. The student needs support to continue to excel.

Level 2: Proficient (L2)

The student's performance indicates understanding and application of key grade level expectations defined for Michigan students. The student needs continued support to maintain and improve proficiency.

Level 3: Partially Proficient (L3)

The student needs assistance to improve achievement. The student's performance is not yet proficient, indicating a partial understanding and application of the grade level expectations defined for Michigan students.

Level 4: Not Proficient (L4)

The student needs intensive intervention and support to improve achievement. The student's performance is not yet proficient and indicates minimal understanding and application of the grade level expectations defined for Michigan students.

For more information, please visit www.michigan.gov/meap

RESULTS FOR YOUR CHILD			
Subject	2013 Achievement Scale Score	2013 Achievement Performance Level	Student's Performance Level Change
Reading	Nonstandard Accommodation No Data Reported		Scores for your child could not be found for the current and/or prior test administrations; therefore a performance level change cannot be reported.
Mathematics	660	1-Advanced D	3-Partially Proficient E
Science	Prohibited Behavior No Data Reported		* Not Available

* Science, social studies, and writing are not measured in every grade, so year-to-year progress cannot be reported.

Fall 2013 Version: 1.0

P0JHVJ003

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Reading

On the reading assessment the students were asked to read for understanding within and across texts and respond to multiple-choice questions and one constructed response question (short essay). All questions on the reading assessment are based upon the Michigan Department of Education English Language Arts Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCEs) for reading. (www.michigan.gov/ela)

Test Score Not Valid

Reading Domains	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Word Recognition & Word Study			
Narrative Text			
Informational Text			
Comprehension			

Mathematics

At the beginning of fifth grade, students are expected to count, read, write, and compare whole numbers up to 1,000,000. They can fluently add and subtract multi-digit numbers, multiply two-digit by three-digit numbers, divide by numbers 10 or less, and use these computations to solve applied problems. The students have developed their understanding of factors and multiples, can estimate sums, differences, and products, and can find the value of the unknown in simple equations. The students have a good understanding of fractional quantities, including decimal fractions, as both part of a whole and part of a set, can compare and order them, locate them on the number line, and find equivalent forms. The students are able to use common measurement tools with precision, can convert quantities within a measurement system (e.g., 2 ft. = 24 in.), and can find perimeters and areas of rectangles. The students understand and use basic properties of 2-D and 3-D shapes to solve problems, can solve problems comparing data presented in bar graphs and tables, and find medians. (www.michigan.gov/mathematics)

The mathematics focal points at the right show the points earned by your student, the points possible, and the percent correct.

A STUDENT AT THE **ADVANCED LEVEL**: Performed mathematical skills, understood concepts and solved complex, non-routine problems consistent with grade level expectations. With instructional support, the student should continue to excel.

L4 Not Proficient	L3	L2	L1 Advanced
300	360	420	480
300	360	420	480

Mathematics Focal Points	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Decimals and Fractions	20	20	100%
Whole-Number Multiplication	16	16	100%
Connections	18	18	100%

Science

During the elementary school grades, students observe and explore the science of living things, the physical world around them, and the elements and processes that make up and affect Earth. Students begin to use inquiry skills to construct new scientific knowledge to make sense of their observable world. They use their senses to test predictions that answer questions. Students reflect on scientific knowledge to decide whether evidence supports decisions that may affect their lives. (www.michigan.gov/science)

Test Score Not Valid

Science Disciplines	Points Earned	Points Possible	% Correct
Science Processes			
Physical Science			
Life Science			
Earth Science			

What is the margin of error (—) ?

The diamond indicates your child's scale score for the tested subject. This is your child's overall subject scale score and is used to determine the level your child achieved. The horizontal bar indicates the margin of error. If your student had taken this same test or a similar test on another day, he/she would likely have scored within this range.

Class Roster

The Class Roster provides summary score information for each subscore grouping (domain, focal point, or discipline) and GLCE assessed within each subject area, as well as detailed information for each student assessed. This report may include multiple pages to report all subscore groupings and GLCEs. This report will be sorted by class/group code (if a Class/Group ID Sheet was returned to the scoring contractor or a class/group code was added during Tested Roster). The Writing Class Roster reports the multiple choice test items results on the first page of the report. The second roster page will display the Narrative, Informational, and Peer Response results for each student. Science results are displayed by form number.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the grade level reported, the assessment cycle, the subject area and, for science, the form number. The teacher name, class/group code, the school name and code, and the district name and code are also provided.

Section B lists each student's name followed by their Unique Identification Code (UIC), and Date of Birth (DOB). The scale score and performance level attained by the student for the current year are reported for all subjects. The previous year performance level, as well as the performance level change, is reported for mathematics and reading.

If a student's test was marked invalid, a reason code is reported in place of the scale score. Descriptions of the codes are listed at the bottom of the page. Performance data is not provided for invalid tests in Section C. Invalid scores are not included in mean calculations.

Section C provides the following information for each subscore grouping and GLCE, detailed by student:

- GLCE assessed
- Number of points possible
- Number of points earned by the student
- Reading constructed response and writing prompt rubric scores and condition codes for reading and writing

Students who were assessed with a braille or an emergency test form are indicated with an asterisk. While the scale scores for these students are reported and included in the scale score mean calculations, they are not included in the more detailed subscore reporting and calculations.

Section D reports the number of students assessed within each class/group code and the mean score for each subscore grouping and GLCE. As stated above, students with invalid tests are not included in the mean calculations.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

A

CLASS ROSTER

Grade 08
Fall 2013
Mathematics



Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOL**
School Code: **99999**

Student Information	2013 Scale Score	2013 Performance Level	2012 Performance Level	Performance Level Change	Proportionality and Similarity										Functions, Linear Equations								Connections	
					N.FL.07.03	N.FL.07.05	N.MR.07.04	A.PA.07.04	A.PA.07.05	A.RP.07.02	G.TR.07.03	G.TR.07.04	G.TR.07.06	Focal Point Total	A.PA.07.11	A.FO.07.12	A.FO.07.13	N.FL.07.07	N.FL.07.08	N.FL.07.09	D.RE.07.01	Focal Point Total	D.AN.07.04	Focal Point Total
Points Possible					2	2	2	4	2	4	2	5	1	24	6	4	1	2	3	1	4	21	4	4
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	NS		3H																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	NS		4M																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	PB		4M																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	NS		4M																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	NS		4M																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	NS		4M																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	NS		4M																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	OL		3H																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	OL		4M																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	OL		3H																					
LASTNAMEXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, UIC: 1234567890 DOB: 01/01/1900	OL		4H																					
Students Reported = 10																								
Students with Valid Scores = 0																								
Mean																								

** Student participated using Braille or Emergency test form. Only scale score and performance level are reported here.
L, M, and H indicate scores in the (L)ow, (M)iddle, or (H)igh ranges of the performance levels.

Performance Level

- 1 - Advanced
- 2 - Proficient
- 3 - Partially Proficient
- 4 - Not Proficient

Mathematics Scale Score Range

- (865 - 952)
- (830 - 864)
- (809 - 829)
- (668 - 808)

Performance Level Change

- SD - Significant Decline
- D - Decline
- M - Maintaining
- I - Improvement
- SI - Significant Improvement

- NA - Not Assessed
- NM - No Matching Student Record
- NR - Not Attempted
- NS - Nonstandard Accommodation

- NV - No Valid Test Score
- OL - Tested in Incorrect Grade
- PB - Prohibited Behavior

Item Analysis Report

The Item Analysis Report provides summary information for each operational multiple choice item and constructed response item on the assessment, including the primary Michigan Grade Level Content Expectation (GLCE) measured by each item. The summary information reports the percentage of students selecting each response and indicates the correct response. The Item Analysis Report is generated for three student populations:

- All Students
- Students with Disabilities
- All Except Students with Disabilities

The aggregate data is reported by class/group, school, district, and state. This report may include multiple pages.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the student population included in the report, the grade level, the assessment cycle, and the subject area. The teacher name, class/group code, the school name and code, the district name and code, and the number of students assessed are also provided. Please note that students who participated using a Braille or Emergency test form, or who are home-schooled, are not included in the assessed count. In addition, only students with valid scores are included in the count.

Section B lists the Item Descriptor Number, reporting category, and GLCE being assessed for each multiple choice item. The Fall 2013 Item Descriptors for each grade level and subject area will be posted **as they become available** on the MEAP website at www.michigan.gov/meap.

Section C indicates the percentage of students selecting each response to the multiple choice questions in section B. A plus sign (+) denotes the correct response. The percentage of students skipping or omitting an item, as well as the percentage of students filling in multiple bubbles for a given item, are also reported. Science is reported for the total group on the first page, then this is followed by results by form number. Most schools will have Form 1 results along with results for the form assigned to the school/district.

Section D (applies to reading and writing only) lists the Item Descriptor Number, the GLCE being assessed, and the Mean Score for the constructed response item. The percentage of students achieving each score level are reported, as are the number of student responses that received each condition code. A mean comparison table for the Narrative and Informational Writing prompts is provided at the bottom of the page to facilitate a quick review.

Condition codes provide a reason the student's response received a score of zero (0). Possible condition codes are listed below:

A = Off topic‡

B = Illegible or written in a language other than English

C = Blank

D = Insufficient to rate

E = Incorrect Answer (reading only)

‡ For SWS only, A = Off-topic/Off-task (This applies only to the Student Writing Sample.)

Use of Item Analysis Results

Some assessment items may be particularly difficult or easy. Educators may consider how well their student groups did on an assessment item or sub-score grouping in relation to the state results reported. State results provide a good comparison for how easy or difficult an assessment item was for all students.

Some GLCEs may be assessed by only a single item. This may make interpretation of item analysis reports more difficult. However, many GLCEs are assessed by multiple items. In most situations, a larger number of assessment items provides more reliable results which is more likely to support inferences teachers and curriculum leaders might have with regards to student performance at the GLCE, domain, focal point, or content area level.

Therefore, teachers and districts may use the Item Analysis Report to pose a hypothesis about how a group of students performed within a GLCE or a sub-score grouping (domain, focal point, or discipline). This hypothesis should be evaluated in light of the number of items assessed and in combination with other assessment and classroom information and professional judgment.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



CLASS ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT

All Students



Grade 04
Fall 2013
Reading

Teacher Name:
Class/Group:
School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOLNAME**
School Code: **99999**



No. of Students Assessed = 1

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Word Recognition & Word Study	1	R.WS.03.02	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Word Recognition & Word Study	2	R.WS.03.08	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Word Recognition & Word Study	9	R.WS.03.08	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Word Recognition & Word Study	23	R.WS.03.08	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Narrative Text	24	R.NT.03.02	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Narrative Text	5	R.NT.03.03	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Narrative Text	13	R.NT.03.03	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Narrative Text	16	R.NT.03.03	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Narrative Text	29	R.NT.03.03	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Narrative Text	30	R.NT.03.03	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Informational Text	3	R.IT.03.01	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Informational Text	4	R.IT.03.01	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	6	R.CM.03.02	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Comprehension	7	R.CM.03.02	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	10	R.CM.03.02	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Comprehension	15	R.CM.03.02	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Comprehension	26	R.CM.03.02	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Comprehension	27	R.CM.03.02	0	0	0	100+	0	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Mult %
Comprehension	8	R.CM.03.03	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	11	R.CM.03.03	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	12	R.CM.03.03	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	14	R.CM.03.03	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Comprehension	17	R.CM.03.03	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Comprehension	18	R.CM.03.03	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Comprehension	19	R.CM.03.03	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	20	R.CM.03.03	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Comprehension	21	R.CM.03.03	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Comprehension	22	R.CM.03.03	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	25	R.CM.03.03	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Comprehension	28	R.CM.03.03	100+	0	0	0	0	0

CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE											
Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	Mean Score	Percent of Students at Each Score Based on 3-point Rubric				Number of Students Receiving Condition Codes				
			0	1	2	3	A	B	C	D	E
31	R.NT.03.03	1.0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Condition Codes:
A = Off topic
B = Illegible or written in a language other than English
C = Blank
D = Insufficient to rate
E = Incorrect answer



This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Students using a Braille or Emergency test form or with invalid test scores are not included in the Item Analysis Report.

Page 1 of 2

+ = Correct Response
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Fall 2013 Version: 1.0

POJ12Y00L

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: **SAMPLE DISTRICT**
District Code: **99999**

SCHOOL ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT

All Students

A

Grade 06
Fall 2013
Social Studies



School Name: **SAMPLE SCHOOLNAME**
School Code: **99999**

No. of Students Assessed = 1

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
History of Michigan								
History of Michigan	1	3H3.0.05	0	100+	0	0	0	0
History of Michigan	2	3H3.0.06	0	100+	0	0	0	0
History of Michigan	3	3H3.0.09	0	0	0	100+	0	0
History of Michigan	4	3H3.0.10	100+	0	0	0	0	0
History of Michigan	6	4H3.0.02	0	0	100+	0	0	0
History of Michigan	5	4H3.0.03	0	100+	0	0	0	0
History of Michigan	9	4H3.0.09	0	0	100+	0	0	0
USHG ERA I								
USHG ERA 1-Beg. to 1620	26	5P3.1.03	100	0+	0	0	0	0
USHG ERA 1-Beg. to 1620	32	5U1.1.02	0	100	0	0+	0	0
USHG ERA 1-Beg. to 1620	16	5U1.2.02	0	0	0+	100	0	0
USHG ERA 1-Beg. to 1620	29	5U1.4.03	0	0	0+	100	0	0
USHG ERA 1-Beg. to 1620	31	5U2.1.02	0	100	0	0+	0	0
USHG ERA 2								
USHG ERA 2-Colonization	30	5U2.1.01	0	0	0+	100	0	0
USHG ERA 2-Colonization	33	5U2.3.04	100	0	0+	0	0	0
USHG ERA 3								
USHG ERA 3-Rev. & New Nation	27	5U2.2.01	0	100	0	0+	0	0
USHG ERA 3-Rev. & New Nation	34	5U3.1.02	0	100	0+	0	0	0
USHG ERA 3-Rev. & New Nation	35	5U3.1.04	100	0	0	0+	0	0
USHG ERA 3-Rev. & New Nation	36	5U3.2.02	100	0	0	0+	0	0
USHG ERA 3-Rev. & New Nation	37	5U3.3.01	0+	100	0	0	0	0
USHG ERA 3-Rev. & New Nation	38	5U3.3.05	0+	0	100	0	0	0
World Spatial Term								
The World in Spatial Terms	39	4G1.0.02	0	0	0+	100	0	0
The World in Spatial Terms	40	4G1.0.05	0+	0	0	0	100	0
Places and Regions								
Places and Regions	41	4G2.0.02	100	0	0	0+	0	0
Human Systems								
Human Systems	42	3G4.0.03	0	100	0	0+	0	0
Human Systems	43	4G4.0.01	0+	0	100	0	0	0
Environ/Society								
Environment and Society	44	3G5.0.02	0+	0	0	0	0	100
Environment and Society	45	4G5.0.01	100	0	0+	0	0	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Domain Standard	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Civic/Pol Found.								
Fnds of Civic & Political Life	7	3C2.0.01	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Fnds of Civic & Political Life	8	4C1.0.01	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Fnds of Civic & Political Life	11	4C3.0.01	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Val/Prin of Amer G								
Val/Prin of American Gov	10	4C2.0.02	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Struct/Func of Gov								
Structure/Functions of Gov	25	3C3.0.01	100	0	0+	0	0	0
Structure/Functions of Gov	13	4C3.0.02	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Structure/Functions of Gov	14	4C3.0.04	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Structure/Functions of Gov	15	4C3.0.07	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Citizen. in U.S.								
Citizenship in the US	28	3C5.0.01	0	100	0+	0	0	0
Citizenship in the US	17	4C5.0.01	0	100	0	0+	0	0
Market Economy								
The Market Economy	19	3E1.0.03	0	0	0	0+	0	0
The Market Economy	18	3E1.0.04	100	0	0+	0	0	0
The Market Economy	20	4E1.0.04	100	0	0+	0	0	0
The Market Economy	21	4E1.0.05	0+	0	100	0	0	0
The Market Economy	22	4E1.0.08	0	0+	0	100	0	0
National Economy								
The National Economy	23	3E2.0.01	0	100	0+	0	0	0
The National Economy	24	4E3.0.01	0	0+	100	0	0	0
Disc./Decision								
Public Disc & Decision Making	12	5P3.1.02	0	0	100+	0	0	0
				</				

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Students using a Braille or Emergency test form or with invalid test scores are not included in the Item Analysis Report.

+ = Correct Response
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Page 1 of 2

Fall 2013 Version: 1.0

P0J12Y00B

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: SAMPLE DISTRICT
District Code: 99999

DISTRICT ITEM ANALYSIS REPORT

All Students

A

Grade 06
Fall 2013
Mathematics



No. of Students Assessed = 2

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Focal Point Topic Code	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Decimal, Fraction Operations								
Using Common Denominators	21	N.FL.05.14	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Using Common Denominators	22	N.FL.05.14	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	18	N.FL.05.18	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	19	N.FL.05.18	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	48	N.FL.05.20	0	0	50	50+	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	50	N.FL.05.20	50	0	0	50+	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	51	N.FL.05.20	50	50+	0	0	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	17	N.MR.05.19	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	27	N.MR.05.19	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	28	N.MR.05.19	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	29	N.MR.05.21	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Applied Problems w/ Fractions	30	N.MR.05.21	0	0	50+	50	0	0
Whole-Number Division								
Division of Whole Numbers	2	N.MR.05.01	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Division of Whole Numbers	3	N.MR.05.01	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Division of Whole Numbers	1	N.MR.05.02	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Division of Whole Numbers	6	N.MR.05.03	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Division of Whole Numbers	26	N.MR.05.03	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Multiply & Divide Wholes	7	N.FL.05.04	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Multiply & Divide Wholes	49	N.FL.05.05	50	0	0	50+	0	0
Multiply & Divide Wholes	53	N.FL.05.05	50+	0	50	0	0	0
Mult, Divide by Powers of 10	4	N.MR.05.15	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Mult, Divide by Powers of 10	25	N.MR.05.15	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Mult, Divide by Powers of 10	41	N.MR.05.15	50+	0	50	0	0	0
Mult, Divide by Powers of 10	20	N.MR.05.17	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Convert Units within System	52	M.UN.05.01	0	50	0	50+	0	0
Convert Units within System	16	M.UN.05.02	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Convert Units within System	32	M.UN.05.02	0	0	50+	50	0	0
Convert Units within System	58	M.UN.05.02	50	0	0	50+	0	0
Convert Units within System	46	M.UN.05.03	50	0	0	50+	0	0
Convert Units within System	12	M.UN.05.04	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Convert Units within System	31	M.UN.05.04	0	50	50+	0	0	0
Convert Units within System	34	M.UN.05.04	50	0	0	50+	0	0

MULTIPLE CHOICE								
Focal Point Topic Code	Item Descriptor Number	GLCE Code	PERCENT RESPONDING					
			A %	B %	C %	D %	Omit %	Multi %
Properties of 2D Shapes/Angles								
Meaning of Angles	36	G.GS.05.02	50+	0	0	50	0	0
Meaning of Angles	37	G.GS.05.02	0	50+	0	50	0	0
Meaning of Angles	38	G.GS.05.02	50	50+	0	0	0	0
Meaning of Angles	11	G.GS.05.04	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Meaning of Angles	5	G.GS.05.05	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Meaning of Angles	9	G.GS.05.05	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Meaning of Angles	15	G.GS.05.05	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Meaning of Angles	40	G.GS.05.05	0	50	0	50+	0	0
Meaning of Angles	45	G.GS.05.05	0	50	0	50+	0	0
Meaning of Angles	42	G.TR.05.01	0	0	50+	0	0	50
Meaning of Angles	44	G.TR.05.01	0	0	50	50+	0	0
Connections								
Meaning of Decimals, %	33	N.ME.05.08	0	50	50+	0	0	0
Equivalent Fractions, Division	39	N.ME.05.10	0	0	50	50+	0	0
Equivalent Fractions, Division	43	N.ME.05.10	0	50	0	0	0	0
Equivalent Fractions, Division	8	N.ME.05.11	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Equivalent Fractions, Division	10	N.ME.05.11	0	0	100+	0	0	0
Equivalent Fractions, Division	13	N.ME.05.11	0	100+	0	0	0	0
Equivalent Fractions, Division	35	N.ME.05.11	50	0	0	50+	0	0
Multiply & Divide Fractions	14	N.ME.05.12	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Multiply & Divide Fractions	23	N.MR.05.13	100+	0	0	0	0	0
Multiply & Divide Fractions	24	N.MR.05.13	0	0	0	100+	0	0
Concept of Volume	47	M.PS.05.10	0	50	50+	0	0	0
Concept of Volume	54	M.PS.05.10	50+	0	0	50	0	0
Make & Interpret Line Graphs	55	D.RE.05.01	0	50+	50	0	0	0
Make & Interpret Line Graphs	56	D.RE.05.01	0	50+	50	0	0	0
Make & Interpret Line Graphs	57	D.RE.05.01	50+	50	0	0	0	0
Make & Interpret Line Graphs	59	D.RE.05.01	0	0	50+	50	0	0
Make & Interpret Line Graphs	60	D.RE.05.02	0	50	50+	0	0	0

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results. Students using a Braille or Emergency test form or with invalid test scores are not included in the Item Analysis Report.

* = Correct Response
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

Summary Report

This multiple page report provides a comparative set of mean scale score information for each grade level, summarized by school, district, ISD, and state. The Summary Report is generated for three student populations:

- All Students

- Students with Disabilities

- All Except Students with Disabilities

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (school, district, ISD, or state), the student population reported, the grade level, the assessment cycle, and the subject area. School, district, and ISD names and codes are included.

Section B provides achievement summary data for multiple years for each subject area. The summary data reported includes the year, the number of students assessed, the mean scale score, scale score margin of error, the percentage of students attaining each achievement level, and the percentage of students that achieved proficiency, meaning they attained either a Level 1 (Advanced) or Level 2 (Proficient) for that subject area. The four most current years of summary data are reported. These data have been recalculated using the career- and college-ready cut scores established in September, 2011. Home schooled students are excluded from the students assessed count at all reporting levels. Private school students are included only at the school level. ISD level reports include both LEA districts and charter schools within the ISD boundaries.

Section C provides summary data on student performance level change compared to the previous administration of the reading and mathematics MEAP tests. The summary data includes the current year and the previous year, the number and percentage of students matched across the two administrations, and the percentage of students in each sub-category of performance level change (e.g., Significant Decline, Decline, Maintaining, Improvement, and Significant Improvement) within each subject area.

Section D provides a progress table with year-to-year transition counts for students in grades 4-8 who were in the previous grade in Fall 2012, took the MEAP in both fall 2012 and fall 2013, and had a matching Unique Identification Code (UIC) for both assessment cycles. This data is provided for mathematics and reading. There is no progress table provided for science, social studies, or writing as those subjects are not assessed in each grade. The progress tables provide the number and percentage of students matched between previous and current MEAP administrations.

Section E provides summary data for each subject area score distribution at the school level only. The summary data reported includes the code and descriptor for each GLCE, the number of students assessed (by form number for science), the mean points earned, the total number of points possible, and the percentage of students earning each point value.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students

A

Grade 06
Fall 2013



School Name: SAMPLE SCHOOL
School Code: 99999

ACHIEVEMENT - SUMMARY

B

3

	Year	No. of Students Assessed	Scale Score		Performance Levels				
			Mean	Margin of Error	4-Not Proficient	3-Partially Proficient	2-Proficient	1-Advanced	Levels 1 & 2
READING	Scale Score Range		(490-730)		(490-601)	(602-618)	(619-652)	(653-730)	(619-730)
	2013	1	594	594-594	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	2012	NA							
	2011	13	631	617-645	8%	15%	54%	23%	77%
	2010	19	632	624-640	5%	5%	79%	11%	90%
MATHEMATICS	Scale Score Range		(470-769)		(470-613)	(614-628)	(629-674)	(675-769)	(629-769)
	2013	2	686	541-831	50%	0%	0%	50%	50%
	2012	NA							
	2011	13	617	607-627	46%	15%	38%	0%	38%
	2010	19	618	610-626	47%	42%	5%	5%	11%
SOCIAL STUDIES	Scale Score Range		(481-729)		(481-592)	(593-624)	(625-648)	(649-729)	(625-729)
	2013	1	586	586-586	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	2012	NA							
	2011	16	608	601-615	19%	75%	6%	0%	6%
	2010	23	606	601-611	17%	78%	4%	0%	4%

FALL 2012 to FALL 2013 PERFORMANCE LEVEL CHANGE COUNTS (PERCENTS)

	Student Group	Performance Level Change Category				
		Significant Decline	Decline	Maintaining	Improvement	Significant Improvement
READING	Not Previously Proficient	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Previously Proficient	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	All Students	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

NOTE: 1 students (100%) were successfully matched from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013

MATHEMATICS	Not Previously Proficient	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
	Previously Proficient	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	All Students	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)

NOTE: 1 students (50%) were successfully matched from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013

NA - Not Applicable.
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.
This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



District Name: SAMPLE DISTRICT
District Code: 99999

SCHOOL SUMMARY REPORT

All Students

A

Grade 06
Fall 2013
Reading



School Name: SAMPLE SCHOOL
School Code: 99999

Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 MEAP Reading Transition Counts

Fall 2012 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2013 MEAP Reading Performance Level							
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Partially Proficient	Low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proficient	Low	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Mid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Advanced	Mid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOTE: 1 students (100.0%) were successfully matched from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013

Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 MEAP Reading Transition Percents

Fall 2012 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2013 MEAP Reading Performance Level							
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Advanced	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 MEAP Reading Transition Percents in Each Row

Fall 2012 MEAP Performance Level		Fall 2013 MEAP Reading Performance Level							
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient		Proficient		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Partially Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Proficient	Low	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	High	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Advanced	Mid	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

This report is for school use only. It may contain data that could be used to identify individual student(s) results.
Due to rounding percents may not sum to 100%.

MICHIGAN
Department of
Education



Michigan Educational Assessment Program

[illegible]

Demographic Report

The Demographic Report provides a summary breakdown of scores by demographic subgroup for each subject area assessed. Summary data reported includes the number of students assessed in each subgroup, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each performance level, and the percentage of students in the “Advanced” and “Proficient” performance levels (Levels 1 & 2) within each subject area. The Demographic Report is generated for three student populations:

- All Students
- Students with Disabilities
- All Except Students with Disabilities

The demographic subgroup scores are aggregated by school, district, ISD, and state. The demographic subgroups are:

- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Economically Disadvantaged (ED)
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Formerly Limited English Proficient (FLEP)
- Migrant
- Homeless

Accommodations subgroups are also reported as follows:

- Standard Accommodations (All Students)
- Non-Standard Accommodations (All Students)
- Standard Accommodations (for English Language Learners)
- Non-Standard Accommodations (for English Language Learners)

Please note the following: 1) summary scores are not provided for subgroups containing less than ten students, 2) home schooled students are not reported, 3) private school students are only reported at the school level, and 4) students with invalid tests are included only in the Non-Standard Accommodations subgroups. There is not a separate reporting subgroup for students enrolled in the district less than one full academic year (LTFAY); all students who tested, unless specified above, are reported. The determination of LTFAY for **AYP** purposes will be calculated separately from the enrollment data submitted via the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS).

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (school, district, ISD, or state), the student population included in the report, the grade level, and the assessment cycle. School, district, and ISD names and codes are included, as applicable.

Section B lists the demographic subgroups, as well as the total student population being reported. Ethnicity subgroups are defined by federal requirements.

Section C reports the number of students included in the subgroup, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each performance level, and the percentage of students in the “Advanced” and Proficient” performance levels (Levels 1 & 2) within each subject area.

Note: Results are not reported for groups of <10.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



ISD Name: **SAMPLE ISD**
ISD Code: **99**

ISD DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT All Except Students with Disabilities

A

**Grade 08
Fall 2013**



ISD	READING							MATHEMATICS							SCIENCE						
	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *	No. of Students Assessed	Mean Scale Score	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Levels 1 & 2 *
Total All Except Students with Disabilities	11	808	36	36	18	9	27	10	817	60	30	0	10	10	10	792	90	10	0	0	0
Gender																					
Male	<							<							<						
Female	<							<							<						
Ethnicity																					
American Indian or Alaska Native	<							<							<						
Asian	<							<							<						
Black or African American	<							<							<						
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	<							<							<						
White	11	808	36	36	18	9	27	10	817	60	30	0	10	10	10	792	90	10	0	0	0
Two or More Races	<							<							<						
Hispanic of Any Race	<							<							<						
Additional Reporting Groups																					
Economically Disadvantaged Yes	10	804	40	40	10	10	20	<							<						
No	<							<							<						
English Language Learners Yes	<							<							<						
No	<							<							<						
Formerly Limited English Proficient	<							<							<						
Migrant	<							<							<						
Homeless	<							<							<						
Accommodations																					
Standard - All	<							<							<						
Nonstandard - All **	<							<							<						
Standard - ELL Only	<							<							<						
Nonstandard - ELL Only **	<							<							<						

Performance Level
1 & 2 - Advanced and Proficient
1 - Advanced
2 - Proficient
3 - Partially Proficient
4 - Not Proficient

< No scores or percents provided if less than 10 students.
* Value may not equal the exact sum of Level 1 & Level 2 due to rounding.
** Results for these students are invalid and not reported. They are not included in the Total Students count.

Comprehensive Report

The Comprehensive Report provides mean scale score and performance level information for each grade level summary by subject area. The District Comprehensive Report lists data for the district, followed by each public school and PSA that is part of the district. The ISD Comprehensive Report provides the data for the ISD as a whole and for each district and Public School Academy within the ISD. Home schooled and private school students are not included on the Comprehensive Report. Only students with valid tests are included in the Number of Students Assessed count.

Section A identifies the title of the report, the level of aggregation (District or ISD), the student population included in the report, the grade level, and the assessment cycle. District and ISD names and codes are included as applicable.

Section B identifies the ISD, district, and schools as determined by the report aggregation (District or ISD).

Section C provides the number of students assessed, the mean scale score, the percentage of students attaining each proficiency level, and the percentage of students that met or exceeded grade level expectations for Michigan students within each subject area.

Note: Results are not reported for entities with <10 students.

MICHIGAN EDUCATIONAL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM



All Students

Grade 08
Fall 2013

[illegible]

* Value may not equal the exact sum of Level 1 & Level 2 due to rounding.

Section 4: Additional Sources of Assessment Results

To access Fall 2013 MEAP results, there are several options available to you. These options include the following:

1. BAA Secure Site Data files

Three data files are available for download from the BAA Secure Site Student Test Scores window for authorized school and district users. The BAA Secure Site can be accessed by authorized users at www.michigan.gov/baa-secure.

These files are:

- Student Data File— includes individual student test results and performance
- Aggregate Data File—includes aggregated school, district, or ISD assessment results
- Student Analysis File Extract (SAFE) - contains item level data for each student with a valid test score in a given subject

2. MI School Data

MI School Data is an online portal that provides views of Michigan education data to help make informed educational decisions, to help improve instruction and to enable school systems to prepare a higher percentage of students to succeed in rigorous high school courses, college and challenging careers. (www.michigan.gov/mischooldata)

3. Writing CDs

CDs containing the images of the 4th and 7th grade writing responses will be mailed to MEAP District Coordinators. The CDs are produced by school and, in addition to the student responses to the writing prompts, will include scoring guides for each of the three types of writing prompts. The scoring guides for writing can also be found on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap).

4. MEAP Downloadable Data Files

There are a number of downloadable files available to the public from the Downloadable Data Files link on the MEAP website (www.michigan.gov/meap). These files include gap analysis, demographics, and proficiency comparisons for both public and non-public schools. These files will be made available when MEAP results are released to the public.

5. Public Interface to the BAA Secure Site

The Demographic Report (described on pages 36 – 38 of this guide) can be accessed through a public interface of our BAA Secure Site. This report can be filtered by State, ISD, District, or School. The interface can be accessed from the MEAP Test Results link on the MEAP web site (www.michigan.gov/meap).

Contact Information

School administrators, teachers, and counselors should become familiar with the report layouts and information contained in this document. If you have questions after reviewing this Guide to Reports, or need additional information about MEAP administration procedures, content, scheduling, appropriate assessment of or accommodations for students with disabilities or English language learners (ELLs), please contact the Michigan Department of Education, Division of Accountability Services, using the contact information listed below:

Division of Accountability Services

Vincent Dean, Director, Office of Standards and Assessment
James Griffiths, Manager, Assessment Administration and Reporting
Gayle de Jong, MEAP Project Manager, Test Administration and Reporting
Andrew Middlestead, Manager, Test Development
Rodger Epp, Science Consultant
Vacant, Writing and Social Studies Consultant
Kyle Ward, Mathematics Consultant
John Jaquith, Assessment Consultant for Students with Disabilities
Jennifer Paul, Assessment Consultant for English Language Learners
Steven Viger, Manager, Psychometrics, Accountability, Research & Evaluation

Phone: 1-877-560-8378, option 2

Fax: 517-335-1186

Web site: www.michigan.gov/meap

E-mail: BAA@michigan.gov